

ciety, you would reduce man from a state "little less than that of the angels" to one little better than that of animals.

Words harsh enough to describe your editorial do not exist in the English language. That editorial is an abdication not only of medical responsibility but of human decency as well.

REVEREND CHARLES E. MILLER, C.M.

*Professor of Biology  
St. John's Seminary  
Camarillo*

*To the Editor:* Heartiest congratulations on the recent editorial in CALIFORNIA MEDICINE, September 1970 on "A New Ethic for Medicine and Society." May all physicians read it and hopefully organize their own study groups on a community level to engage themselves in serious debate concerning these issues.

I have been engaged in weekly discussions for over two years in a large multi-discipline group and our two theologians took offense at the hint of an erosion of the Judeo-Christian ethic and that human lives in the future may be judged by relative rather than absolute values. The many physician members of the group have persuaded them, I believe, that this editorial was sagacious, timely and most inspiring. Our dialogue has been most enriching and mutually educative.

Thanks for continually making CALIFORNIA MEDICINE currently aware.

H. HARRISON SADLER, M.D.

*Associate Clinical Professor of Psychiatry,  
and Ambulatory and Community Medicine;  
Chief, Psychiatric Liaison Service,  
University of California, San Francisco*

## Where's the Action?

*To the Editor:* Perhaps you or some of our older colleagues can set my thinking straight on some troubling issues? I seek this guidance for I find

myself right in the generation gap—too young to be Establishment and too old to believe in revolution and destruction of institutions.

A concerned group of whoever poses a legitimate problem—say, any number of documented dissatisfactions with health care delivery. Dedicated sincere colleagues of ours who sit in responsible positions acknowledge the legitimacy of these disputations and set about to do something. Why is it that that "something" is invariably referral to committee for "study" or its analogues, the survey, the feasibility study, or the hand-wringing quest for more research. Can nobody do anything about *anything*?

I hate to be facetious but someone told of a "right-on" poster wherein a pleading child in the last stages of malnutrition is saying, "I'm hungry—thank you for calling a Conference on Hunger." Is this the way of the world? Is this necessarily the way of California medicine?

I would hope someone can relieve me of my negative feelings toward committees, councils, societies, and associations. Has anything been done, created or instituted by a committee that has been accepted as effective by the supposed target population?

ALAN D. MATZGER, M.D.  
*San Francisco*

• Who has some answers?—Editor.

*To the Editor:*

## Orthopedic Ecology

The infused young orthopedic surgeon is well versed in re fusing backs.

The confused middle-aged orthopedic surgeon is well versed in re-fusing backs.

The defused old orthopedic surgeon is well versed in refusing backs.

Ergo, the land is profuse with refuse.

CHRISTOPHER A. MASON, M.D.  
*Los Angeles*